

EXHIBIT 3

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

FEB 17 2021

CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: [Signature] Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT 304

STYLEFORM IT,

Plaintiff,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC., ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-18-571075

ORDER RE JOINT STATEMENT
REGARDING COMPETING PROPOSED
PROTECTIVE ORDERS

On February 5, 2021, the Court issued an order directing the parties to either file a joint stipulation and proposed order or file competing proposed protective orders accompanied by a joint statement addressing the differences between the two proposals. The parties timely complied with the order by filing a joint statement appending their competing protective orders as exhibits on February 16, 2021. Having reviewed the joint statement and the competing proposals, the Court hereby resolves the disputes between the parties. The parties shall submit a joint proposed protective order consistent with the following discussion on or before February 26, 2021. The parties shall also submit two redlined documents, one showing the differences between Plaintiff's proposal and the joint proposal and the other showing the differences between Defendants' proposal and the joint proposal.

1 (1) Section 2.7. The Court will adopt Plaintiff's proposed language. The Court is not persuaded
 2 that the additional restrictions found in Facebook's proposal are appropriate in this case. Plaintiff's
 3 version provides appropriate protection.

4 (2) Section 3. The Court will adopt Plaintiff's proposed language. Documents that are in the
 5 public domain as a result of leaks in other litigation are in the public domain. Plaintiff's version provides
 6 appropriate protection.

7 (3) Sections 7.3(c), 7.4(b), and 7.5. The Court will adopt Plaintiff's proposed language. The
 8 Court is not persuaded that the additional restrictions found in Facebook's proposal are appropriate in this
 9 case. Plaintiff's version provides appropriate protection.

10 (4) Section 13. The Court will adopt Defendants' proposed language. The Court is not persuaded
 11 that the protective order should include the presumption requested by Plaintiff. Defendants' proposal is
 12 appropriate.

13 (5) Section 14. The Court will adopt Plaintiff's proposed language. The Court is not persuaded
 14 that the additional restriction found in Facebook's proposal will further the purpose of the protective
 15 order. Plaintiff's version provides appropriate protection.

16 (6) Section 15. The Court will adopt Defendants' proposed language. The Court finds
 17 Defendants' version adequate to protect the pertinent interests. The Court also finds Defendants' version
 18 easier to follow and enforce.

19 (7) Notice and Acknowledgment. The Court will adopt Defendants' proposed language. The
 20 Court is persuaded that Defendants are requesting a requirement that is reasonably necessary to ensure
 21 that the protective order is enforceable. Accordingly, the Court is persuaded that Defendants' language is
 22 reasonably necessary to ensure that the protective order provides Defendants meaningful protection.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: February 17, 2021



25
 26 Anne-Christine Massullo
 27 Judge of the Superior Court
 28

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE
(CCP 1010.6(6) & CRC 2.251)


I, Ericka Larnauti, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On February 17, 2021, I electronically served the attached document via File & ServeXpress on the recipients designated on the Transaction Receipt located on the File & ServeXpress website.

Dated: February 17, 2021

T. Michael Yuen, Clerk

By: _____


Ericka Larnauti, Deputy Clerk